DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 203 821 HE 014 094

AUTHOR Booth, David
TITLE The Making of a Good Department. Structure and Process in Departmental Development.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 27p.: Revised version of a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association (Edmonton, Alberta, 1975).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; College Role; Conflict Resolution; Decision Making; Department Heads; *Departments; *Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; Foreign Countries; *Governance; Higher Education; *Organizational Change; Professional Development; Research; *Sociology; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *University of Windsor (Canada)

ABSTRACT

The process by which the sociology department at the University of Windsor, Ontario, Canada, has changed character and resolved situations of conflict and polarization is examined. The sociology department experienced rapid growth and the university as a whole shifted from teaching as a single function to teaching and research. It is suggested that there are competing institutional and departmental forces at work in moderately selective institutions. One set focuses on system maintenance, which emphasizes teaching, stability, and service. The competing forces support a more academic environment through the recruitment of new faculty whose primary orientations are in research and graduate education. At Windsor University there was the expected shift from a more centralized pattern of governance to one in which the department as a whole was involved in major and minor decision-making. However, the focus of the department was on unresolved personnel conflict. Multiple strategies were developed to take into account the interest of faculty in reviewing new models of professionalism and developing new levels of skill, and new structures were established in the department to protect faculty time and recognize high levels of achievement. Equal weight was given to scholarship, teaching, and service in the evaluation of faculty achievement. Teaching was scored by pooling student evaluations on 10 questions, and faculty could receive service points for chairing departmental committees, thesis advising, community work, and other activities. An attempt was made to enable discussion of professional issues, to resolve conflicts, and to recruit more cosmopolitan graduate students. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED203821

THE MAKING OF A GOOD DEPARTMENT[1]

Structure and Process in Departmental Development

David Booth

Department of Sociology-Anthropology

University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario Canada N9B 3P4

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David Booth

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE0140 094

Revision of Paper Presented at the 1975

Annual Meeting of the

Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association

Edmonton, Alberta

INTRODUCTION

This paper presents a preliminary report on the process by which the Sociology Department at the University of Windsor changed from the "bete noire" of the university to become one of its best managed departments. The focus of the report is on sociological perspectives which foster excellence, diversity, and collaboration among faculty in moderately selective universities.

We seldom ask what it takes to make a "good department" in a university that accepts most students (a Carnegie III type). The natural tendency of a meritocratic discipline is to concentrate attention on the conditions of life in the most selective institutions. Can we produce more "good departments" in moderately selective universities to add to the productivity and vitality of the discipline? Moderately selective departments have the capacity to create the conditions in which faculty take the action necessary to maintain and improve professional competencies. Once engaged in such activities, faculty will be willing to accept more universalistic evaluation systems. When a department stimulates and rewards achievement, supportive developmental processes can be created. Our experience at Windsor suggests that these structures and processes can be consciously developed and can partially overcome a history of dysfunctional conflict.

THE CONTEXT: THE MODERATELY SELECTIVE UNIVERSITY

Our focus is on an evolutionary process generic to moderately selective institutions which shift from teaching as a single function to teaching and research.[2] As they grow, they mix faculty with divergent professional orientations. The moderate selectivity of faculty, the dependence of the institution on student recruiting from the surrounding area, the interpenetration of the community into the university through appointments and purchasing arrangements, combine to create conditions which weaken commitments to academic values and scholarship. The dominant culture emphasizes accommodation and instrumental values. Faculty with continuing commitments to scholarship and achievement based on universalistic standards tend to be isolated.[3] If those with power in moderately selective institutions could have had their way, the status quo would have been maintained through continuing emphasis on service with a reluctant toleration of cosmopolitan faculty.

But the demand for new faculty in the sixties prevented a stabilization of power. New Canadian universities built to enhance access to average students grew. They accepted many students who chose the social sciences. The Sociology Department at Windsor enrolled 698 students in course units in 1966-67. By 1968-69 this number had grown to 1,841. During this period of rapid growth, attention was concentrated on managing growth rather than creating structures and processes to maximize the effectiveness of departments.

One way to deal with problems of rapid growth was to ignore them. However, as an institution shifts its emphasis from teaching to research faculty insist on more autonomy. As research activity increases, departments become more stratified. Those with research interests cluster together. Faculty who have not engaged in research find they have little

in common with research "stars." Stars talk to stars, a few faculty bridge both camps, and those with few research interests become ritualists or become particularly close to students. If their faculty colleagues ignore them, they need allies and colleagues. As this process of departmental segregation and stratification continues, faculty self-images crystallize.

The moderately selective institution or department attempts to hide this ambiguity and the conflict-potentials which underlie the stratification of faculty by adopting a laissez-faire system of governance. Teaching is assigned on a traditional basis. Merit raises or promotion may be made as much for service as for achievement. People become full professors on the basis of service, teaching rather than through research. Loyalty and service are what counts. The research star will be promoted but often grudgingly. The ambiguity of the system marks the lack of consensus within the department regarding criteria of achievement. Underachievers in research have little incentive to excel as teachers since teaching is assumed to be a chore which we all do about equally well. Since there is little incentive to excel in teaching, and few excel in research, attention shifts to politics. The political or administrative role becomes an attractive functional alternative academic achievement. The situation masks latent motives of faculty to develop professional skills which could permit a shift from a dependent to an independent role.

To summarize, there are competing institutional and departmental forces at work in moderately selective institutions. <u>One set focuses on system maintenance</u>. These emphasize teaching, stability, service. Faculty are recruited primarily on the basis of their campatability with colleagues and their willingness to commit themselves to teaching and service.

There is little selectivity among students since students come primarily from the local community and region. The homogeneity of student culture which this implies makes it difficult to enforce universalistic standards of excellence in grading. The few students who excel find they have little competition. They can do better than their peers with little effort. The competing forces support a more academic environment through the recruitment of new faculty whose primary orientations are in research and graduate education. To attain excellence in research, changes in governance and education become essential.

The conflict between achievement and loyalty as criteria of service is endemic to all institutions. However, the conflict appears particularly acute in moderately selective institutions that have grown rapidly. Here we find vestiges of status and loyalty systems that are in constant tension.

RAPID GROWTH, CONFLICT, POLARIZATION -- A CASE STUDY

Rapid Growth. Sociology and Anthropology was originally part of the university's Social Science Division. Charter faculty in the social sciences developed close personal friendships that persisted as they became chairmen and administrators. The first chairman of the Sociology Department at Windsor carried a heavy teaching load, oversaw a heavy recruiting schedule, and conducted research. Rapid and unpredictable increases in student enrollment forced the department to seek part-time help the last minute. He recruited part-time faculty from Wayne to man extra sections, since Wayne State University was just across the river and the chairman had good contacts there. Although this satisfied the administration and kept teaching costs low, it made it difficult for the department to develop a pride in self and a sense of its own destiny. Many departments have recruited from a local university. It provides a ready source for talent and provides the chair with a dependable and loyal faculty.

Later the department began to compete in an international market for faculty. One consequence was that the department may have bent over backwards to promise faculty the moon to get them to come to Windsor. To the extent that faculty felt seduced by extrinsic options, the cooling off period was rough when they found that everything promised could not be given. One consequence of rapid growth was the recruitment of faculty to fill positions rather than to contribute to a shared concept of what the department should be. This comment is not intended as criticism. If one reads the history of the University of Windsor during the sixties, one sees how committed the university was to accommodate growth. The Sociology department simply fell into a pattern common to many other departments during the sixties.

Conflict Over Governance and Professionalization. When the university's Senate asked departments to shift from patterns of centralized decision-making to more collegial forms of governance in 1968, the transition was uneven in sociology as in other departments. The chairman had contacts with administration which permitted him to obtain support for the department and to make decisions quickly. It was simpler to make a decision by talking things over with a Dean than to try to get consensus from a group of sociologists. Because the university had no formal or informal system to assess the satisfaction of faculty with administration, there was no way to anticipate problems of governance in a way that could protect chairmen and faculty.

Personality differences masked differences in conceptions of how the department should professionalize and at what rate. Remember that the sixties was a period of "instant professionalization." It was natural for some members of the department to feel that the time was ripe to establish a Ph.D. programme. But if this was to be done, changes were needed in recruitment and evaluation policies. Since the institution had no mechanism to review the goals of departments and to permit minority and majority views to be expressed, changes in basic policy orientation were mainly sought through change in departmental leadership. In the process, personality conflicts tended to mask conflict and continuity in professional orientations.

Polarization. Pressures for change in governance style, aspirations for a more professional department, and the personality conflicts that one finds in any department led to demands that the chairperson step down the year before his term ended. But to achieve this goal, a two-thirds vote of students and faculty was necessary. In the election

battle that followed, students found themselves caught between rival faculty factions. Although the group that opposed the chairman succeeded in obtaining the two-thirds vote necessary to hold a new election, the department was polarized. After the vote there was no reconcilation between the competing factions.

These were the days of student activism. In the period following the election of a new chairman in 1969, coalitions of alienated faculty and students were formed. Those seeking personal or organizational power and those who failed to meet minimal professional standards of competence joined in uneasy alliances legitimated by talk of autonomy, radical idealogy, and the protection of minorities. The conflict was accentuated by the generic problems of life in a joint department.

What is important is not the details of the conflict but the sense of anomie that developed as one crisis led to another. The "zone of indifference" which protects faculty from involvement in departmental affairs was bridged by the constant move from one crisis to another. The intensity of the conflict and the intense polarization of the department involved faculty who under ordinary conditions would have remained indifferent to departmental politics.[4]

If the administrative view of governance is to take into account change within institutions and the academic professions, administration needs to understand the source of constructive and dysfunctional conflict within departments. At Windsor there was no bridge between administration and sociology to monitor conflict and interject the necessary statesmanship to moderate conflicting interests.

Administrators value accommodation and adjustment over activism. The administrator must deal with pressures for control as well as faculty

pressures for autonomy. During the 1960's student and faculty activism was concentrated in sociology departments. The anti-authority syndrome which brought both groups into sociology led to faculty pressures for departmental autonomy and student demands for institutional change and reform. The administrative climate in Canada was ill-prepared to deal with this activism. The traditional view of institutional governance was that faculty should present its views through university Senates. The budget was to be in the hands of Boards of Governors (who in turn were controlled by administration). There were few legitimate channels by which pressures for change in control systems could be expressed.

Under these conditions sociology departments were viewed by administrators, at least in Ontario, as "children." One president described Ontario sociology departments as centres of dysfunctional conflict.

> The key fact, of which you may not be aware, is that almost all Presidents regard the Department of Sociology in their institution as a special problem child. There are few happy exceptions across the province, but most of us...are wearied and disgusted by the problems which are regularly generated within the Department of Sociology. Trivial tendentious and irresponsible theorizing, personal feuds carried to extreme lengths, with a total indifference to the reaction of colleagues and students, would seem to be the main manifestations of some fundamental malaise.

This statement accurately described the external view of the Department of Sociology at the University of Windsor among adminstrators and many faculty in 1972. They assumed that conflict was nasty and necessarily unproductive. Little did the administration or the department know that by 1975, sociology would be perceived as one of the most professional departments in the university.

The change that occurred in the department did not come in response to external pressures for accountability. It came through internal

activities largely generated without the knowledge or active support of the administration. This case history of departmental development shows how a department can improve given a hostile external environment and a turbulent internal environment. Since these conditions are not unique to Windsor, the case history should be instructive to other departments.

THE MAKING OF A GOOD DEPARTMENT

Laissez-faire in a Divided Department

Departmental governance moves in a cycle from centralized control by a few to participative democracy and then back to centralized control (when it becomes obvious that faculty won't do the work which democracy requires). At Windsor there was the expected shift from a more centralized pattern of governance to one in which the department as a whole was involved in major and minor decision-making. However, the focus of the department was on unresolved personnel conflict. Traditional sources of authority had been deposed. There was no substitute consensus providing new norms for governance.

The department paid a high price for its rapid change in governance. The divisions within the department led to a diversion of energies into non-productive conflict. Decisions which should have taken minutes took days. New programme development suffered. Initial plans to make the department the focus of programmes in social organization in the province, complementing the programme in Population Studies at Western Ontario, were not developed. Options to develop collaborative programmes in Media and Communications were not pressed by the Communications Studies Department since it perceived sociology as so involved in internal conflict that it hesitated to link with it in interdisciplinary studies.[5]

New Concepts, New Faculty

How was the department to move from a focus on laissez-faire, polarization and time-consuming meetings? Without norms to legitimate collaboration on essential matters, a few faculty were able to use the radical spirit of the late sixties to forge an informal coalition with fearful faculty and students. As long as people's image of self and

department focussed on zero-sum game strategies, conflict escalated. Time that could have been devoted to productive work was wasted scapegoating.

Although faculty were tired of non-productive conflict, they had no alternative models to turn to. Preoccupation with past conflict obscured rational analysis. Renewal began when Dr. Terrence White, a graduate student from the University of Toronto, joined the department. He and other young faculty began modelling new patterns of professional activity. They emphasized work over politics.

The process of building a good department also required departmental action to eliminate some faculty who were primary sources of dysfunctional conflict.[6] While developing the normative structures to do this in a way that respected due process safeguards, the department acted to create a larger critical mass of faculty who would support professionalization, new governance structures, and developmental processes. Let us consider these over-lapping stages in the building of a good department.

Stage 1: Increasing Faculty Skill.

The accumulation of new knowledge in sociology, as in other disciplines, makes it necessary for faculty to remain up-to-date. In most departments, faculty want to be active and productive. But sometimes faculty lack basic skill in research. Dr. Terrance White intervened in the department with new models reflecting active personal scholarship combined with the willingness to share information and skill. He felt the future of the department would depend on increasing the proportion of faculty who were actively working on professional matters. One way to increase this number was to help faculty learn to use the computer

so tasks that would be impossible to complete by hand could be completed. He realized that a modest investment of time teaching colleagues how to use the computer would have major impacts on scholarship and teaching.

The first step was to obtain the S.P.S.S. package and to make it operational. With that done, Dr. White invited interested faculty to three one-hour seminars to teach them how the S.P.S.S. package simplifies data analysis. Faculty completed a few trial runs using dummy data. Afterwards those working on their doctorates used the computer to analyze their data. This expedited completion of their doctorates. Other faculty began to use the computer to begin new research. As faculty became skilled and confident through successful computer use in research, they began to introduce computer programming into the curriculum. Students now use the computer in the study of research methods, statistics, Canadian Society, and other courses. Once faculty became assured of competence on the computer, they organized a self-supporting seminar for approximately 15 colleagues at a regional meeting of the North Central Sociological Association several years later. This process of modelling, skill-training, and providing social support to spur new learning was initiated in computer learning. But the process continued at Windsor in other forms.

Without any formal "programme," a variety of developmental activities were begun. These included team teaching (two faculty team taught for two years), guest lectures, and most important, regular brown-bag luncheons and evening discussions. (Evening meetings are held in faculty homes). These internal activities are complemented by discussions with outsiders. A telephone discussion was arranged with Dr. Hal Sheppard in Washington, D.C. to discuss research on work. Raymond Breton, Delbert

Clark and Robert Presthus, among others came to discuss their research. These visitors met with a substantial proportion of faculty and students. Faculty met informally afterwards with these invited guests.

Periodic interaction with significant others in the profession raised the sights of faculty and provided options for new contacts and collaboration. It gave faculty new self-esteem as they found their ideas and competencies validated by external colleagues. Critical review of new ideas among colleagues within a specialty occurs naturally in the most selective universities where there is a sufficiently large mass of specialists. But it usually takes careful planning to produce comparable dialogue among faculty in moderately selective institutions. Visits by outsiders kept attention focussed on big issues. It permitted faculty to test new approaches to inquiry.

Thus during Stage 1 multiple strategies were developed to take into account the interest of faculty in reviewing new models of professionalism and developing new levels of skill. This was achieved not by fiat but through an informal alliance of young and old faculty who shared intrinsic interests in research and teaching. Perhaps the common bond was ambition for professional success and a shared aspiration for a more professionalized environment.

Stage 2: New Structures to Channel and Reward Achievement.

Once a critical mass of faculty began work to reach new standards of excellence, the groundwork was laid for new structures in the department that would protect faculty time and recognize high levels of achievement.

The protection of faculty time came through allocation of clear and significant functions to committees and the recruitment and support of a

strong secretarial group. Departmental committees were re-activated. Once responsiblity was delegated, progress was monitored by the chairman. As committees assumed more responsibility for deliberation departmental meetings could be devoted to a review of committee recommendations. Responsibility for daily work of the department gradually shifted from a few people to working committees supported by a responsible and capable secretarial group. The combination of working committees and an effective and pleasant support staff provided the conditions which effectively protected faculty time.

Since the conditions for effective work had been created, the atmosphere was ripe to create systems of evaluation that recognized and rewarded excellence. First this was done for teaching -- next for other functions.

De-Personalizing Teaching Evaluation. In the late sixties the department depended in large part on hearsay evidence to evaluate teaching. As students gained power and representation on Departmental Councils, the quality of teaching evaluation could depend on the perspectives and contacts of one or two student representatives. If faculty were to be protected from irresponsible student evaluation, yet made accountable for good teaching, some system was required to balance objective evaluations with selective perceptions of students and faculty. This was particularly important as the department professionalized.

Early in the 1971-72 academic year the department agreed on a set of questions for its teaching evaluation form which would be used by the Promotion and Tenure Committee as the major criterion to evaluate teaching. To reach this decision, it met several times at brown bag luncheons. It examined alternative instruments and reviewed a factor analysis of

the present evaluation questionnaire to identify questions that tapped separate evaluative dimensions.[7] Finally it agreed on ten questions whose pooled ratings would give a measure of the quality of faculty teaching.[8] These were the questions which the Promotion and Tenure Committee used to assess the teaching achievement of faculty. Of course, this system is no panacea. Questions about teaching focus on teaching style rather than on the quality of student learning. Faculty who press for autonomous inquiry skills rather than for memorization are often penalized in the evaluation. Students get bored with evaluations. Thus the validity of their responses is problematic. Nevertheless, the system of comparing faculty on the same questions permitted the department to move from a system of evaluation that is largely personal to one which is more systematic and uniform. Although subjective information is still used, the major benchmarks of achievement come from behaviour that is not controlled by any individual.

De-Personalizing Evaluation of Scholarship and Service. Early in the 1970's the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the Department began to evaluate faculty achievement on the assumption that equal weight would be given to scholarship, teaching and service. The job of the Committee was to evaluate and reward different profiles of achievement. Some faculty would be exceptional in one dimension. Others would have average or irregular profiles. The job of the Committee was to insure minimal achievement in each area and to reward superior achievement in one or more areas. Once the Promotion and Tenure Committee made its recommendation to the chairman, the guidelines for making merit increments were established.

But this process was perceived to be a decision made by an external

group. When Dr. White became chairman, he believed that we could advance from our past system of letting the Promotion and Tenure Committee make these decisions to create a point system that would permit each faculty member to total his or her "points" at the end of the year. In this way we could monitor our own progress. Our achievement would determine annual merit raises. The department would decide how much each "point" would be worth in dollars. Once these decisions were made, the secretary of the Department could make the tally to determine how many merit dollars each faculty member would earn each year. (The chairman and the Executive Committee would monitor faculty point tallies to be sure that they were made fairly). If this type of system could be agreed on, it could further reduce the personalization of relationships in the department. People would have tangible evidence that merit raises depended on achievement and activity rather than on who they knew.

A change as profound as this required the understanding and support of faculty. To obtain this support Dr. White discussed this proposal personally with every member of the department. Although some opposed the system, it was impossible to argue publicly against a plan that would key merit pay to achievement. Once the groundwork was laid through personal discussions, the department met as a faculty over drinks to discuss the idea. Later a committee presented a proposal for a point list which was revised and adopted by the department. It gave equal weight to excellence in teaching, scholarship and service. Scholarly activity included publications, papers and research in process. Teaching was scored by pooling student evaluations on ten questions. Faculty could receive service points for chairing departmental committees, thesis

advising, lecturing in other courses, community work, or for outstanding achievement in professional associations. Thus a diversified reward system was created. (The point system is explained in detail in Appendix 1.).

Professionalization Without Isolation. Professionalization can lead to the rigid rejection of requests that a department integrate effectively with its environment or become adaptable to changing institutional requirements. The Sociology Department did not move in this direction. Its new structure of governance and leadership monitored the external as well as the internal environment.

Plans were made to keep the department active in the community and in the university. When the administration asked that departments extend their offerings to include evening courses, Sociology was one of the first departments to volunteer to do so. This permitted part-time students to complete work for an M.A. The effectiveness of graduate programmes in meeting the needs of mature students led to invitations to faculty to become educators and consultants in the community. The community work of faculty reflected credit on the department, made the department more visible, and led students to enrol in the graduate programme. Thus the department had an active and reciprocally beneficial relationship to its community.

The department was equally alert to options for collaboration with faculty in other departments. Informal seminars were organized and joint programmes were operating with faculties in Organization and Work Studies, Law, and Health and Recreation. In some cases there are cross-listed courses. These relationships reflect a concept of sociology as an active department with strong sources of internal strength. It

rejects the view of sociology as a service unit that should help others without expecting reciprocal support. The department has been careful to assess mutual interests and strengths before entering into collaborative relationships. Thus the relationships which are built between departments and faculty recognize the unique capabilities of both parties. They tap functional inter-dependencies which make collaboration fruitful for both parties.

Stage 3: Maintaining Developmental Processes.

The department recognizes the need to nurture growth. Continued development depends, in its view, on inventiveness in maintaining an active faculty dialogue on professional matters and in recruiting a more cosmopolitan graduate student body.

Stimulating Debate of Professional Issues. Although faculty have strong commitments to new perspectives in sociology they tend to share these ideas with those who are "already committed." This is natural. The department can, however, create new options for vigorous faculty dialogue. Already mentioned are brown bag luncheons and evening discussions. Complementing these have been meetings that bring together faculty from several departments to discuss a particular issue. For example, a brown bag luncheon on basic perspectives in social psychology. It organized comparable meetings on new perspectives in the study of organizations for faculty in several departments. It hopes to open up professional dialogue to clarify issues and stimulate interest through productive airing of "conflict." Note the contrast between this channelled and open discussion of professional issues with the non-productive and highly personal conflict which used to eat up the time of many faculty.

Recruiting More Cosmopolitan Graduate Students. There is a limit to what can be done to stimulate faculty dialogue. Faculty choose colleagues who share their perspectives. The intellectual ferment which it seeks can be produced naturally by graduate students who press faculty to examine their ideas.

Regional universities attract regional students. Even though the academic quality of the institution may change, the orientation of local students may not. To the degree that the university recruits from a locality that is of working or lower-middle class origins, its students may give little support to academic values. The few who do and are serious quickly become stars. There is little incentive for them to compete in a student body that is recruited from their locality. Thus a highly stable system is created in which student stars are quickly identified. Able students do not face competition from those of equal talent from other regions.

Recognizing this situation, the department agressively began to recruit graduate students from other Canadian universities. Fortunately, it is now in a position to be much more selective in admissions. Moreover, it is approaching the point where the critical mass of cosmopolitan graduate students will be large enough to challenge each other and provide a spur to faculty. A nascent graduate culture and a professionalizing faculty should reinforce each other to make a "good department."

THE ROLE OF THE CHAIRMAN

The process of renewal which is required to keep a department moving involves hard work for faculty, students and the chairman. When we in the academic professions denigrate the role of administration, we do

so at our peril. Academic work depends on the changing relationship between self and others. If a chairman takes the time to systematically talk with every member of the department periodically, there is time to sense peaks or valleys in morale and support the peaks and move people out of the valleys. A chairman can model commitment, discipline, good humour, and a willingness to move incrementally through the range of work which is required to achieve quality. Simply asking how things are going gives faculty a chance to share information and get valuable feedback. Terrence White was this type of chairman. If negative feedback was required, it was given in private. Accurate and immediate feedback was provided which permitted issues to be identified and resolved.

The Sociology Department today operates under the assumption that a divided department is a weak department. No matter what a person's professional background, as long as he/she is a member of the department, it is assumed that he/she can strengthen the department. The department has been working to create the conditions which minimize the segregation of faculty into first and second class citizens. Its goal is to create the conditions in which people work to maintain present strengths, while maintaining sufficient activities and interests in research so that they are not exclusively typed as teachers or researchers.

RESULTS

A preliminary analysis of results indicates that the changes in skill level, structure and process have had desired effects on individual faculty, the department, and the university. The effects on personal achievement are clear. Faculty who were defined by others as marginal have attained the doctorate, improved their teaching and scholarship, and are beginning to make significant contributions to Canadian scholarship. The department's scholarly productivity has risen and the quality of its teaching has improved. Partially in response to new information on grant possibilities, faculty are actively applying for grants. An environment has been created where you know other people are working. New and persistent structural and internal pressures for achievement press faculty to achieve new standards of excellence.

Changes in structure have not transformed faculty. There has been an interaction between new structures and processes and changing faculty motives and potential. This interactional process causes an internalization of new standards of excellence. People are working at scholarship and teaching with new levels of commitment and competence. Faculty are beginning to expect more of themselves and students. This is no mechanical process. It involves constant re-focusing of effort and commitment with changing combinations of success and failure. A dynamic process is at work which, on the whole, creates higher quality and quantity work for all.

In the department mechanisms have been created to carry on the necessary administrative work and to make policy without getting sidetracked in personal disputes. Council meetings takes less time. People spend more time at work -- less on on gossip. When an issue occurs, it is usually settled promptly. Everyone is not satisified with every

decision. But decisions are made promptly and in a collegial fashion. This reduces the tendency to balloon issues and let them fester. The support staff consciously stays out of departmental politics. It extends equal courtesies to all faculty.

Within the university, the department is assessed on a comparative basis by administration. Since it moved from a focus on political to professional issues, the administration is pleased. Quality teaching, at least in a comparative perspective, appears to give it a larger undergraduate enrollment in the introductory courses than does psychology although psychology has many more faculty. Judicious investment of faculty time creates a quality Introductory Programme (Introductory, Social Problems, and Criminology) and produces the credit hours which justify a selective and low enrollment programme in upper level undergraduate and graduate courses. The administration is pleased, too, at the capacity to complete reports on time and to monitor internal activities. This reflects an active and alert governance structure and support staff. The support staff watches budget expenditures carefully so that the department knows how much it spends and does not overspend.

The administration has a better understanding of what the department does and what it legitimately needs. Even though administration does not understand sociology, nor necessarily approve of it, it finds itself blessed by a department that knows what it is doing and why. This approval has helped the department retain faculty positions in an era of retrenchment.

IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIOLOGY

The development of the proper balance between professionalism and adaptation to client needs is a difficult one, especially in a mod-

erately selective university. Despite the heterogeneity of faculty orientations, the instrumental and pragmatic commitments of administration and community, sociology at Windsor has shown how a coalition of faculty can use academic freedom to create an active environment -- one which recognizes the legitimate interests of faculty, students, and the community.

An organizational system has been developed which recognizes the legitimacy of diversity, yet establishes the incentives, rewards for achievement, and the developmental processes which keep faculty productive while reaching for the stars. If comparable systems can be created organically in other sociology departments, the capacity of the profession to grow will be enhanced. Perhaps the "rationalization" of effort which is so dearly sought by government commissions can be fostered by greater support for internal developmental processes and structures such as those described here.

The Windsor experience suggests the capacity of a tenured faculty to absorb and creatively put to work the ambitions and competencies of new faculty. It suggests the importance of putting our competence in organizational design to work in our own departments.

FOOTNOTES

1. The concepts developed in this paper were developed through extended discussions with Dr. Terrence White. I am indebted to him for assistance in clarifying the concepts presented here.

2. See Peter Blau, The Organization of Academic Work. (John Wiley and Sons, 1973).

3. One can over-emphasize the heterogeneity of faculty orientations in moderately selective universities. For the best data on this subject see Oliver Fulton and Martin Trow, "Research Activity in American Higher Education," Sociology of Education, Winter 1974.

4. The concept of a "zone of indifference" which was broken by departmental conflict was brought to my attention by Dr. Robert Whitehurst.

5. Background information on lost options for internal and external development was provided by Drs. Rudolph Helling and Walter Romanow.

6. Dr. Robert Prus brought this matter to my attention.

7. The factor analysis was suggested and performed by Dr. Terrence White.

8. The evaluation of teaching was made by summing average to superior ratings on a Likert scale for the following questions:

   - As a result of this course my inclination to take further courses in this field has increased.
   - The grading system in this course measures basic understanding of the course content.
   - How would you rate your instructor in terms of general, overall effectiveness as a teacher?
   - The instructor appears to be knowledgeable in the subject matter of the course.
   - The lectures or classes are interesting and stimulating.
   - The instructor is able to explain concepts and principles in the course clearly.
   - The instructor is prepared for classes and class sessions are organized and coherent.
   - If you had known when you registered what you now know of this teacher would you have registered in his course?

(Point system for merit awards).

APPENDIX 1

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

MERIT

NAME: _____ DATE: _____

(Merit based on work for the period from APRIL 1ST TO MARCH 31ST of each year).

1. TEACHING & COUNSELLING	Merit Points		
- Ranking of teaching by P & T Committee (Questions 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 17):			
"outstanding"	5	____	
"excellent"	4	____	
"very satisfactory"	2	____	
- Chair of thesis committee(s) _____	2	____	(max. 2)
- Member of thesis committee(s) _____	1	____	(max. 1)
- Department Counsellor	1	____	(max. 1)
- Directed Readings Supervisor _____	1.5	____	(max. 1.5)
- Participation in seminars as outsider (e.g., Soc. 400, 100, Anthro.110, etc) _____	.5	____	
_____	.5	____	(max. 1)
- Other Counselling _____	.5	____	(max. .5)
	Total:	____	(max. 10)

2. RESEARCH & SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES			
- Textbook or Monograph published _____	7	____	
- Ph.D. Thesis completion	4	____	
- Referred article published, reader published _____	3	____	
- Technical Report _____	1	____	(max. 1)